

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

FEBRUARY 18, 1848.

Submitted, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURNEY made the following

REPORT :

*The Committee on Patents and the Patent Office, to whom was referred the petition of Aaron Carmon, have had the same under consideration, and make the following report:*

That some years since, the petitioner filed his application at the Patent Office, for the purpose of obtaining a patent for his new and useful invention in a plough, and in a clivis, and filed with the Commissioner of the Patent Office, his specifications and drawings of his invention; and the commissioner, after a full and careful examination thereof, came to the conclusion, and so determined, that the petitioner was the inventor of the improvement of the clivis, and, accordingly, granted him a patent for the same; but as to the supposed improvement of the plough, upon examination, it was found that it had been previously discovered by another, to whom a patent had been granted, and, therefore, he refused to grant a patent to the petitioner, and, as your committee believes, very properly. Your committee would, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution.

*Resolved,* That the prayer of the petitioner be not granted.

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

January 15, 1848

REPORT

The Committee on Patents and the Patent Office, to whom was referred the petition of Horace Combs, have had the same under consideration, and make the following report:

That some years since, the petitioner filed his application at the Patent Office, for the purpose of obtaining a patent for his new and useful invention in a plough, and in a chisel, and filed with the Commissioner of the Patent Office, his specifications and drawings of his invention; and the commissioner, after a full and careful examination thereof, came to the conclusion, and so determined, that the petitioner was the inventor of the improvement of the chisel, and, accordingly, granted him a patent for the same; but as to the supposed improvement of the plough, upon examination, it was found that it had been previously discovered by another, to whom a patent had been granted, and, therefore, he refused to grant a patent to the petitioner, and as your committee believe, very properly. Your committee would, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the prayer of the petitioner be not granted.